



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/494,954	02/01/2000	Roger A. McCurdy	TRW(TE)4170	4158

7590 05/17/2002

Tarolli Sundheim Covell Tummino & Szabo LLP
1111 Leader Building
526 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-1400

EXAMINER

LUM, LEE S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3611

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/494,954

Applicant(s)

McCurdy, Roger

Examiner

Lum, Lee S.

Art Unit

3611



-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sh et with th c rr spond nce address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Req for Reconsideration filed 3/21/02

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.

2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the applica

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from considera

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirem

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. A Request of Reconsideration was filed 3/21/02.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 10, 14, 17 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ross 5884203.

Ross discloses system 10 for protecting a vehicle occupant comprising
crash sensor/accelerometer 12,
acoustic sensor 14 which senses acoustic activity propagating through the vehicle
structure, and provides signals indicative of the crash event (Col 4, lines 1-6; "high-frequency
signals generated as a result of metal being deformed during a crash event"),
occupant protection devices (unidentified), and,
controller 22.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-9, 11-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross in view of Thompson et al 6020812.

Ross does not specify a plurality of accelerometers and crush sensors placed at various locations of the vehicle, while Thompson shows this configuration with accelerometers 48 and crush sensors 50. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time at which the invention was made to include another type of crash sensor, and placed in particular locations, to increase the accuracy of determining a crash event, therefore increase the efficiency of the airbag system. Both Ross and Thompson suggest that any configuration of such sensors, and similar sensors, in various vehicle locations, would have been obvious.

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure: Ando 6198999, Kraft 6099030, Foo et al 6036225, Corrado et al 6026340, 5890085, Breed et al 6009970, 5848802, 5653462, Breed 6209909, 5684701, Stanley 6007095, Varga et al 5943295.

5. RESPONSE TO REMARKS: Moot in light of new art rejections.

6. Communication with the Examiner and USPTO

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Ms. Lum at (703) 305-0232, 9-530, M-F. Our fax number is (703) 308-2571. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to customer assistance at (703) 306-5771.

Ms. Lee S. Lum, Examiner
5/13/02



PAUL N. DICKSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600